

REMARKS

The following Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed July 17, 2008. Claim 7 has been amended. Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-13 remain pending in the application. Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 7-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicant has amended claim 7 by removing the term "providing" at the beginning of each step, and moving the structural clauses to the end of each element. For example, Applicant has corrected the step of "providing a purchase data retrieval module installed in a web server for obtaining purchase data from the purchase management system, and storing the purchase data in a database" to the step of "obtaining purchase data from the purchase management system and storing the purchase data in a database by using a purchase data retrieval module installed in a web server" in claim 7.

Based on these amendments, it is submitted that amended claim 7 is directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 8-13 depend directly from amended independent claim 7, thus claims 8-13 are also directed to statutory subject matter. Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice, therefore the objection relating thereto is now moot. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

I. Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037014, hereinafter "Shimizu") in view of Zeif (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0167238).

II. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Zeif as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Greene, Production and Inventory control Handbook, Third Edition, McGraw Hill, copyright 1997, pg. 27.6 (hereinafter “Greene”).

III. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Zeif, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0023418, hereinafter “Suzuki”).

In Response

As indicated on page 8 of the current Office Action, claims 1-6 are allowed.

Amended claim 7 is the equivalent of claim 14 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 7. Thus, amended claim 7 should be allowable (see below).

Claims 8-13 depend directly from amended independent claim 7, and therefore should also be allowable in their current dependent forms.

Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice, therefore the objection relating thereto is now moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6 are allowed.

Claims 7-13 would be allowable if claim 7 incorporated the subject matter of claim 14, and if the claims were amended to recite statutory subject matter in the manner indicated above.

Applicant has amended claim 7 by incorporating the substance of the subject matter of claim 14 therein. Accordingly, claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 8-13 depend directly from amended independent claim 7, and therefore should also be allowable in their current dependent forms.

Appl. No. 10/748,312
Amdt. Dated August 27, 2008
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 17, 2008

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Juei-Mei Wang

By /Frank R. Niranjana/ Dated: August 27, 2008

Frank R. Niranjana

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649